

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The applicants' attorneys appreciate the Examiner's thorough search and remarks.

Claims 1 and 24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Naidoo et al. (Naidoo), U.S. Patent No. 6,658,091. Reconsideration is requested.

Naidoo discloses a security system which allows for, among other functions, the ability of remote surveillance of a premises through a network. Specifically, remote user 150 can access security gateway 115, which is installed at a premises (e.g. a residential unit), for the purpose of sending and receiving messages.

A system according to the present invention, however, relates to an integrated security and intercom system for a multi-unit dwelling. Thus, claims 1 and 24 call for a plurality of user interfaces each associated with a respective dwelling. Furthermore, claims 1 and 24 call for first and second risers, each connecting a respective plurality of user interfaces.

On the other hand, Naidoo discloses only one user interface 115 associated with a dwelling, which can be accessed remotely by a remote user 150. Naidoo fails to suggest or disclose a plurality of user interfaces connected to one another with a respective riser as called for by claims 1 and 24.

Furthermore, claim 1 calls for a central communication station which is connected to the risers and is capable of sending text messages to one, to all, or to a selected group of the user interfaces. Naidoo does not teach or suggest such a feature. Reconsideration is requested.

As stated earlier, a system according to the present invention relates to an integrated intercom and security system. Thus, claim 24 further requires a remote door lock, which can be opened by a user interface, and an electronic directory, which only discloses the names of the occupants (not the occupant's unit number) as an additional security measure. Naidoo does not teach or suggest an operative relationship between a door lock and a user interface, and also fails to disclose an electronic directory as called for by claim 24. Reconsideration is, therefore, requested.

Claims 2-7, and 12-23 depend from claim 1, either directly or indirectly. Claims 25 and 26 depend from claim 24. Each dependent claim includes additional limitations which in

combination with those of its base claim are not shown or suggested by the art of record.


Reconsideration is requested.

The application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on March 28, 2006:

Kourosh Salehi

Name of applicant, assignee or  
Registered Representative




Signature

March 28, 2006

Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Kourosh Salehi

Registration No.: 43,898

OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP

1180 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036-8403

Telephone: (212) 382-0700

KS:gl